

On the group theoretic structure of a class of quantum dialogue protocols

Chitra Shukla and Vivek Kothari

Jaypee Institute of Information Technology, A-10, Sector-62, Noida, UP-201307, India.

Anindita Banerjee

*Department of Physics and Center for Astroparticle Physics and Space Science,
Bose Institute, Block EN, Sector V, Kolkata 700091, India.*

Anirban Pathak*

*Jaypee Institute of Information Technology, A-10, Sector-62, Noida, UP-201307, India. and
RCPTM, Joint Laboratory of Optics of Palacky University and Institute of Physics of Academy of Science of the Czech Republic,
Faculty of Science, Palacky University, 17. listopadu 12, 77146 Olomouc, Czech Republic.*

(Dated: March 1, 2013)

Intrinsic symmetry of the existing protocols of quantum dialogue are explored. It is shown that if we have a set of mutually orthogonal n -qubit states $\{|\phi_0\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, \dots, |\phi_i\rangle, \dots, |\phi_{2^n-1}\rangle\}$ and a set of $m - \text{qubit}$ ($m \leq n$) unitary operators $\{U_0, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{2^n-1}\} : U_i|\phi_0\rangle = |\phi_i\rangle$ and $\{U_0, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{2^n-1}\}$ forms a group under multiplication then it would be sufficient to construct a quantum dialogue protocol using this set of quantum states and this group of unitary operators. The sufficiency condition is used to provide a generalized protocol of quantum dialogue. Further the basic concepts of group theory and quantum mechanics are used here to systematically generate several examples of possible groups of unitary operators that may be used for implementation of quantum dialogue. A large number of examples of quantum states that may be used to implement the generalized quantum dialogue protocol using these groups of unitary operators are also obtained. For example, it is shown that GHZ state, GHZ -like state, W state, 4 and 5 qubit Cluster states, Ω state, Brown state, Q_4 state and Q_5 state can be used for implementation of quantum dialogue protocol. The security and efficiency of the proposed protocol is appropriately analyzed. It is also shown that if a group of unitary operators and a set of mutually orthogonal states are found to be suitable for quantum dialogue then they can be used to provide solutions of socialist millionaire problem.

I. INTRODUCTION

First protocol of unconditionally secure quantum key distribution (QKD) was proposed by Bennett and Brassard in 1984 [1]. In a QKD protocol two remote legitimate users (Alice and Bob) can establish an unconditionally secure key by using quantum resources i.e. by the transmission of qubits. The protocol of Bennett and Brassard which is popularly known as BB-84 protocol, draw considerable attention of the cryptographic community since the unconditional security of key obtained in this protocol is not achievable in classical cryptography. Naturally, since 1984 several new protocols for different cryptographic tasks have been proposed. While most of the initial works on quantum cryptography [1–3] were concentrated around QKD, eventually quantum-states were applied to other ‘post-coldwar’ cryptographic tasks. For example, in 1995, Goldenberg and Vaidman [4] proposed a protocol of quantum secure direct communication (QSDC), then in 1999, a protocol for quantum secret sharing (QSS) was proposed by Hillery [5]. In the same year, Shimizu and Imoto [6] proposed a protocol for deterministic secure quantum communication (DSQC) using entangled photon pairs. In the Goldenberg-Vaidman

protocol and in Shimizu-Imoto protocol Alice can communicate a message to Bob directly with unconditional security. Other important protocols for QSDC were later proposed [7, 8]. In a DSQC protocol, the receiver can read out the secret message only after the transmission of at least one bit of additional classical information for each qubit. A QSDC protocol does not require exchange of classical information. Since the pioneering works of Goldenberg and Vaidman [4] and Shimizu and Imoto [6] several protocols of DSQC and QSDC are proposed ([9] and references there in). But in all these QSDC and DSQC protocols, the meaningful information (secret message) travels only from Alice to Bob¹. In other words in these protocols, Alice and Bob can not simultaneously transmit their different secret messages to each other (dialogue) and consequently advent of these protocols naturally leads to a question: Is it possible to extend these protocols for bidirectional quantum communication in which both Alice and Bob will be able to communicate (with unconditional security) using the same quantum channel. Such bidirectional protocols are quantum dialogue protocols where information can flow along two

¹ The protocol may be a two way protocol like Ping-Pong protocol [7] or LM-05 [8] protocol but the meaningful information (message) is transmitted from Alice to Bob only. Thus the flow of information is unidirectional (one way) only.

* anirban.pathak@upol.cz

directions (i.e. from Alice to Bob and from Bob to Alice). Such protocols are actually an essential requirement of our everyday communication problems. This can be visualized more clearly if we consider the analogy of a telephone. The possibility of extending the DSQC and QSDC protocols and the absolute need of bidirectional quantum communication motivated the quantum communication community to investigate the possibility of designing of quantum dialogue protocols. First protocol of quantum dialogue was proposed by Ba An [10] using Bell states in 2004. Eventually it was found that the protocol is not secure under intercept-resend attack [11]. But a minor modification of the protocol can make it unconditionally secure and such modified protocol was first proposed by Man, Zhang and Li [11]. Later on Xia *et al.* proposed a protocol of quantum dialogue using *GHZ* states [12] and Dong *et al.* proposed a protocol of quantum dialogue using tripartite *W* states [13]. But in essence all these protocols are same. Here we will refer to all these protocols as Ba An type of protocol and provide a general structure to them. In recent past several protocols of quantum dialogue have been proposed using i) dense coding [11, 12, 14], ii) entanglement swapping [15], iii) single photon [16], iv) auxiliary particles [17] etc. These protocols are referred as bidirectional quantum communication protocols [17], quantum telephone [14, 18], quantum dialogue [10, 16], quantum conversation [19] etc. These are different names used for equivalent protocols. Here we will refer all of them as quantum dialogue and provide a generalized structure to the Ba An type of quantum dialogue protocols and will use the generalized structure to obtain several examples of quantum systems where quantum dialogue is possible. Before we describe those specific quantum system it is important to understand that in quantum dialogue the communication between Alice and Bob is simultaneous. The simultaneity implies that quantum channel (i.e. the quantum states on which the classical information of Alice and Bob are encoded) must simultaneously contain the information encoded by both parties. This particular point distinguishes quantum dialogue protocol from the QSDC and DSQC protocols. Otherwise, Alice and Bob can always communicate with each other by using DSQC/QSDC in two steps or by using two different quantum channels (i.e. by using a DSQC/QSDC scheme from Alice to Bob and another from Bob to Alice) but as the secret information of Alice and Bob are not simultaneously encoded in the same quantum channel, this is not quantum dialogue. This important and distinguishing feature of quantum dialogue is often overlooked by authors. For example, Jain *et al.*'s [19] protocol is essentially two QSDC. Clearly, their protocol is not a protocol of quantum dialogue as Bob knows the encoded information of Alice even before he encodes his own information.

The remaining part of the paper is organized as follows: In Section II, we have briefly described the Ba An protocol and have explored its intrinsic symmetry. We have observed that information splitting is in the core of these

protocols². In Section III we have provided a sufficient condition for construction of quantum dialogue protocol and have shown that the operators used for encoding of information in a quantum dialogue protocol should form a group. In Section IV we have provided a generalized protocol of the quantum dialogue. To implement the protocol we require a set of unitary operators that form a group under multiplication and a set of mutually orthogonal states on which the information are to be encoded by these group of unitary operators. A systematic procedure for construction of such groups and specific examples of states that can be used to implement the generalized protocol of quantum dialogue are provided in Section V. It is shown that *GHZ* state, *GHZ-like* state, *W* state, Cluster state, Ω state, Q_4 state and Q_5 state can be used for implementation of quantum dialogue protocol. Finally Section VI is dedicated for conclusion where we have concluded our discussion about the group theoretic structure of quantum dialogue protocols and have shown that if a group of unitary operators and a set of mutually orthogonal states are found to be suitable for quantum dialogue then they can be used to provide solutions of socialist millionaire problem too.

II. THE BA AN PROTOCOL AND ITS INTRINSIC SYMMETRY

Let us first describe Ba An's original scheme of quantum dialogue. This simple scheme works in following steps:

1. Bob prepares large number of copies of a Bell state $|\phi^+\rangle = \frac{|01\rangle + |10\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$. He keeps the first photon of each qubit with himself as home photon and encodes her secret message 00, 01, 10 and 11 by applying unitary operations U_0, U_1, U_2 and U_3 respectively on the second qubit. Without loss of generality we may assume that $U_0 = I$, $U_1 = \sigma_x = X$, $U_2 = i\sigma_y = iY$ and $U_3 = \sigma_z = Z$ where σ_i are Pauli matrices.
2. Bob then sends the second qubit (travel qubit) to Alice and confirms that Alice has received a qubit.
3. Alice encodes her secret message by using the same set of encoding operations as was used by Bob and sends back the travel qubit to Bob. After receiving the encoded travel qubit Bob measures it in Bell basis.
4. Alice announces whether it was run in message mode (MM) or in control mode (CM). In MM, Bob decodes Alice's bits and announces his Bell basis measurement result. Alice uses that result to decode Bob's bits. In CM, Alice reveals her encoding value to Bob to check the security of their dialogue.

² Information splitting plays the central role in every secure quantum communication protocol.

It is easy to recognize that this is a modification of Ping-Pong protocol and the operations used for encoding are the operators usually used for dense coding and the protocol starts with an initial state $|\psi\rangle_{\text{initial}} = |\phi^+\rangle$. Now after Step 1, $|\phi^+\rangle$ is mapped to one of the Bell state $|\psi\rangle_{\text{intermediate}} = U_B|\psi\rangle_{\text{initial}} = U_B|\phi^+\rangle$ depending upon the secret message of Bob which is encoded by unitary operation U_B (to be precise, we may say that the state at this time is one of the Bell state $I|\phi^+\rangle = |\phi^+\rangle$, $X|\phi^+\rangle = |\phi^+\rangle$, $iY|\phi^+\rangle = |\phi^-\rangle$, $Z|\phi^+\rangle = |\phi^-\rangle$). Thus in the second step, second qubit of one of the Bell states (one of the mutually orthogonal states) is communicated to Alice via the quantum channel. At this stage neither Alice nor Eve can know what information is sent by Bob as they have access to only one qubit of the entangled pair. Now in Step 3 Alice encodes her message using the same set of unitary operations and Alice's encoding will map the state into another Bell state ($|\psi\rangle_{\text{final}} = U_A|\psi\rangle_{\text{intermediate}} = U_A U_B|\psi\rangle_{\text{initial}} = U_A U_B|\phi^+\rangle$). Now here information splitting is done in an excellent way. Alice, Bob and Eve, all know $|\psi\rangle_{\text{initial}}$ and $|\psi\rangle_{\text{final}}$ states. But in addition, Alice and Bob knows the unitary operators used by them for encoding. Availability of these additional information allows them to decode each other's information and lack of this information makes it impossible for Eve to decode the information encoded by Alice and Bob. To make it more clear, assume that $|\psi\rangle_{\text{final}} = |\phi^+\rangle$ thus $U_A U_B = I$, this is possible in 4 different ways: $U_A = U_B = I$, $U_A = U_B = X$, $U_A = U_B = iY$, $U_A = U_B = Z$. Thus from the initial state and final state Alice and Bob can come to know the encoding of each other but for Eve all encodings are possible. She just obtains a correlation between the encoding of Alice and that of Bob. In this particular example, Eve knows that Alice and Bob have encoded the same message (same classical bits in this particular example), but that does not reveal the encoding of Alice and Bob. Since in this quantum dialogue protocol secure classical information (4 bits of classical information in this case as 2 bits are send from Alice to Bob and 2 bits are send from Bob to Alice) that is communicated using the quantum channel is more than the dense coding capacity of the quantum channel, so it is obvious that some correlation between Alice's encoding and Bob's encoding will be obtained by Eve. This is recently pointed out by Tang and Cai [20]. But the information splitting is done in such a way that the correlation does not directly leak the encoding. To be precise, in the above example, even after knowing the correlation (i.e. both Alice and Bob have encoded the same classical message) Eve will not be able to develop any procedure to obtain the encoding of Alice. For Eve all the encoding of Alice are equally probable. So she has to guess randomly. If her guess is correct (whose probability is 1/4) only then she will correctly obtain Bob's encoded information. Now the probability of Eve's success can be reduced by three means: 1) Using multipartite entangled states. For example, if we use 2^5 unitary operations and 5 qubit Brown state [21] to implement quantum dialogue

protocol then the success probability of Eve would be $\frac{1}{32}$ only. This is so because after obtaining the correlation Eve has to guess among 32 equally probable alternatives. This point would be more clear when we will describe the generalized protocol. 2) By encoding lesser amount of information in the quantum channel (compared to the dense coding capacity of the quantum channel). In that case it is obvious that Eve's mean information gain on Alice and Bob's bits would reduce [20] and 3) by using both 1 and 2 above. Here it is important to note that the existence of a classical correlation between the encoding of Alice and Bob is an intrinsic problem to quantum dialogue protocols but there are strategies (as mentioned above) to circumvent that problem and essentially the security of all Ba An type of quantum dialogue protocols arises from the above described process of information splitting.

The protocol of Ba An appears quite satisfactory up to this point. But there is a problem, Eavesdropping check is done at the last stage and the protocol is not safe under intercept-resend attack. This was first pointed out by Man, Zhang and Yong [11]. The idea behind the attack is simple: Eve intercepts the travel photon, keeps it with herself and prepares a fake entangled pair in $|\phi^+\rangle$. She keeps the home (first) photon of this fake entangled states and sends the second one to Alice. As Alice can not distinguish it from the qubit sent by Bob, she will encode her message. On the return path Eve will intercept her fake travel photon and do a Bell measurement on the fake entangled pair to obtain the message encoded by Alice. Once Eve knows the unitary operation used by Alice she would apply the same unitary operation on the actual travel photon and send it back to Bob. After Bob announces publicly his Bell basis measurement result, Eve can deduce Bob's bits. Thus the protocol of Ba An is not secure under this intercept-resend attack. In order to make it secure we have to change the strategy for Eavesdropping checking. There exist two simple and equivalent strategies which can be used to make the Ba An protocol secure: 1) From Bob to Alice communication, Bob keeps some qubits as verification qubits and after confirming that Alice has received the qubits, he announces the position of verification qubits. Now verification qubits are measured by Alice randomly in $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ and $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$ basis. After the measurement Alice announces the measurement outcome and the basis used, then Bob measures the corresponding qubits in the same basis. Looking at the correlation of the outcomes, Alice and Bob would be able to determine the presence of Eve. 2) When Bob sends a sequence of travel photons then he can insert equal number of decoy photons randomly in the sequence of the travel photons. These decoy photons are prepared randomly in $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$ states. After confirming that Alice has received all the qubits, Bob announces the position of the decoy photons. After Bob's announcement Alice randomly measures decoy qubits in $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ and $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$ basis. After the measurement, Alice announces the measurement outcomes and the basis

used. If she has chosen the correct basis (the same basis in which decoy state is prepared) the measurement outcomes will be in perfect correlation with the decoy states prepared by Bob. In any of the above two strategies, if Eve is detected then Alice does not do her encoding operation and the protocol is truncated. On the other hand, the absence of Eve in the communication channel from Bob to Alice would essentially mean that no fake photon sequence has been sent to Alice and that will make the protocol secure against intercept-resend attack. The first strategy was used by Man, Zhang and Li [11]. We will use the second (decoy photon) strategy. So far we have seen that a clever choice of information splitting plays the key role in the construction of quantum dialogue protocols. To construct a generalized protocol of quantum dialogue we need a deeper understanding of this information splitting process. To be precise, a deeper understanding of the information splitting process would help us to obtain a more general and sufficient condition for construction of quantum dialogue protocol. Then just by using standard tricks of Eavesdropping checking and the sufficient conditions we will construct a generalized protocol of quantum dialogue.

III. SUFFICIENT CONDITION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF QUANTUM DIALOGUE PROTOCOL

Before we generalize the protocol we need to visualize certain intrinsic symmetries and requirements of the Ba An type of protocols. In the following discussion $|\psi\rangle_{\text{initial}}$ is an n -qubit state in general, $|\psi\rangle_{\text{intermediate}}$ is the $n - \text{qubit}$ state after encoding operation of Bob and $|\psi\rangle_{\text{final}}$ is an n -qubit state after encoding of Alice. Thus they are not limited to Bell states. Now, we can note that after encoding operations of Bob, the initial state $|\psi\rangle_{\text{initial}}$ must be mapped to a mutually orthogonal set of intermediate states ($|\psi\rangle_{\text{intermediate}}$). Because only in that case, Alice would be able to deterministically discriminate the intermediate states prepared by Bob and thus will be able to decode the encoded message. To be precise, if we have k unitary operations $U_0, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{k-1}$ and Bob encodes i^{th} message by applying the unitary operator U_{Bi} , then after the encoding operation the initial states are mapped to $U_{Bi}|\psi\rangle_{\text{initial}} = |\psi_i\rangle_{\text{intermediate}}$: $\langle\psi_i|\psi_j\rangle_{\text{intermediate}} = \delta_{i,j}$. Following the same logic, Alice's encoding operation U_{Ai} should also map the intermediate states to a mutually orthogonal set of final state, i.e. $U_{Ai}|\psi_i\rangle_{\text{intermediate}} = |\psi_i\rangle_{\text{final}}$: $\langle\psi_i|\psi_j\rangle_{\text{final}} = \delta_{i,j}$. Now the Hilbert space of $n - \text{qubit}$ states is C^{2^n} . Therefore, we can have at most 2^n mutually orthogonal states in that space. Let us denote these states as $\{|\phi_0\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, \dots, |\phi_i\rangle, \dots, |\phi_{2^n-1}\rangle\}$. It is easy to recognize that these states are nothing but the elements of a mutually orthogonal basis set in C^{2^n} . To make the remaining discussion convenient, without loss of generality, we may assume that at the beginning of

the generalized protocol, Bob prepares a large number of copies of the state $|\phi_0\rangle$. Now to encode an arbitrary $n - \text{bit}$ classical message we would require 2^n unitary operators. In principle one can choose to work with less number of encoding operations but that would not have any effect other than reducing the communication efficiency. So for an efficient protocol we need 2^n number of $m - \text{qubit}$ unitary operations $\{U_0, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{2^n-1}\}$ where $m \leq n$. As the operators are required to map the initial state $|\phi_0\rangle$ into one of the state vector of the mutually orthogonal set $\{|\phi_0\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, \dots, |\phi_i\rangle, \dots, |\phi_{2^n-1}\rangle\}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $U_i|\phi_0\rangle = |\phi_i\rangle$. If $m < n$ then we have dense coding, and if $m = \frac{n}{2}$ then we have maximally efficient dense coding. Thus all those physical systems where dense coding is possible can be used for encoding of information by one party and thus all such systems can be used for DSQC. It is a sufficient criterion for DSQC but not essential (as for cases where $m = n$, there dense coding will not happen but encoding will happen). But dense coding is not even sufficient for quantum dialogue protocol of Ba An type. Here the demand is more because the encoding is done by both Alice and Bob using same set of operators. So after the encoding operation of Alice (say U_j) and that of Bob (say U_i) the final states must also be a member of the mutually orthogonal states to ensure the deterministic discrimination of the state and thus to decode the encoded message. To be precise, $|\psi\rangle_{\text{final}} = U_j U_i |\phi_0\rangle = U_j |\phi_i\rangle \in \{|\phi_0\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, \dots, |\phi_i\rangle, \dots, |\phi_{2^n-1}\rangle\} \forall i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, 2^n - 1\} \Rightarrow U_B U_A \in \{U_0, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{2^n-1}\}$. Thus the product of any two arbitrary unitary operators should be a member of the set of unitary operators. This is a property of group. So we may conclude that if we have a set of mutually orthogonal n -qubit states $\{|\phi_0\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, \dots, |\phi_i\rangle, \dots, |\phi_{2^n-1}\rangle\}$ and a set of $m - \text{qubit}$ unitary operators $\{U_0, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{2^n-1}\}$ such that the $U_i|\phi_0\rangle = |\phi_i\rangle$ and $\{U_0, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{2^n-1}\}$ forms a group under multiplication then it would be sufficient to construct a quantum dialogue protocol of Ba An type. This is true in general as information splitting in the sense of Ba An protocol is possible and Eve knows only $|\psi\rangle_{\text{initial}}$ and $|\psi\rangle_{\text{final}}$. Consequently, Eve knows the product of the operators of Alice U_j and that of Bob U_i . Say $U_j U_i = U_k$ and $|\psi\rangle_{\text{final}} = U_k |\psi\rangle_{\text{initial}}$. Now from the rearrangement theorem of groups we know that each row and each column in the group multiplication table lists each of the group elements once and only once. From this, it follows that U_k can be decomposed in 2^n different ways. Thus all possible 2^n encoding of Bob may lead to the same U_k . Now if Eve wants to obtain the secret information encoded by Alice and Bob then she has to guess either U_i or U_j , i.e. she has to guess among 2^n equiprobable events. Clearly, the probability of her success is 2^{-n} and consequently the quantum dialogue protocol of the present type are more secured when a multi-partite state is used. To be precise, if the quantum dialogue is implemented using Bell state, 5-qubit Brown state and 6-qubit cluster states respectively then the probability of Eve's success

is 25%, 3.1% and 1.6% respectively. Now since the multipartite entangled states can be experimentally prepared (for example 6-qubit cluster state is experimentally prepared by C. Y. Lu *et al.* [22]) so efficient quantum dialogue protocols with negligible information leakage can be designed. Actually, to correctly decompose U_k and thus to decode the encoded information one needs one of the factor U_i or U_j and those are available with Alice and Bob respectively. Consequently, they can successfully decompose U_k and decode each others secret message. Thus the intrinsic beauty of these protocol lies in the group structure of the unitary operators and the security (more precisely an upper bound on the security) of the protocol arises in general from the clever use of rearrangement theorem.

We have obtained a sufficient condition for construction of quantum dialogue protocol of Ba An type. It can be noted that all those cases where dense coding is already reported and the operators used for dense coding form a group can be used for quantum dialogue. In addition new examples of possible implementations of dense coding and quantum dialogue can be obtained in a systematic way. We will provide several examples of such cases in Section V. We have discussed the information splitting process involved in the quantum dialogue protocols in general but have not described the security of the protocol against intercept-resend attack. Same would be described in next section while we describe the generalized protocol. Before we do so, we would like to note something more on the structure of the unitary operators.

As long as we restrict ourselves to the domain of discrete communication and claim that the output states are mutually orthogonal, our operation on individual qubits can only be done by doing nothing (i.e. applying I), flipping the qubit (i.e. applying $X = \sigma_x$), flipping the phase (i.e. applying $Z = \sigma_z$) or flipping both phase and bit (i.e. applying $iY = i\sigma_y$). We can not have any other operations, because that would always take us out of the set of mutually orthogonal states. Thus no operator other than $(I, \sigma_x, i\sigma_y, \sigma_z)$ are applied to a single qubit and consequently we may decompose any m qubit unitary operations as tensor product of m single qubit operations as:

$$U(m) = U_1(1) \otimes U_2(1) \otimes \cdots \otimes U_m(1) : U_i(1) \in \{I, \sigma_x, i\sigma_y, \sigma_z\}, \quad (1)$$

where $U(j)$ denotes a j -qubit unitary operation. Now we are ready to describe our generalized protocol.

IV. GENERALIZED PROTOCOL OF QUANTUM DIALOGUE

Our generalized protocol works using the above mentioned $n - \text{qubit}$ mutually orthogonal states $\{|\phi_0\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, \dots, |\phi_i\rangle, \dots, |\phi_{2^n-1}\rangle\}$ and m -qubit unitary operators $\{U_0, U_1, \dots, U_{2^n-1}\}$ as follows:

1. Bob prepares a large number of copies (say N copies) of state $|\phi_0\rangle$, and encodes his classical secret message by applying m -qubit unitary operators $\{U_0, U_1, \dots, U_{2^n-1}\}$. For example, to encode $0_1 0_2 \cdots 0_n, 0_1 0_2 \cdots 1_n, 0_1 0_2 \cdots 1_{n-1} 0_n, \dots, 1_1 1_2 \cdots 1_n$ he applies $U_0, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{2^n-1}$ respectively. The information encoded states should be mutually orthogonal to each other as discussed above.
2. There are two possibilities: i) $m < n$ i.e. dense coding is possible and ii) $m = n$ i.e. dense coding is not possible for set of quantum states and set of unitary operators used for encoding. If $m < n$, then Bob uses the m photons on which encoding is done as travel photons and remaining $n - m$ photon as home photon and keeps them with himself in an ordered sequence $P_B = [p_1(h_1, h_2, \dots, h_{n-m}), p_2(h_1, h_2, \dots, h_{n-m}), \dots, p_N(h_1, h_2, \dots, h_{n-m})]$ where the subscript $1, 2, \dots, N$ denotes the order of a n -partite state $p_i = \{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_{n-m}, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m\}$, which is in one of the n -partite state $|\phi_j\rangle$ (value of j depends on the encoding). Symbol h and t are used to indicate home photon (h) and travel photon (t) respectively. If dense coding is not possible then he has to use all qubits as travel qubits. In general, he uses all the travel photons to prepare an ordered sequence $P_A = [p_1(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m), p_2(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m), \dots, p_N(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m)]$. Now before transmitting the travel qubits to Alice, Bob first prepares Nm decoy photons in a random sequence of $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$, i.e. the decoy photon state is $\otimes_{j=1}^m |P_j\rangle, |P_j\rangle \in \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$, ($j = 1, 2, \dots, m$). Then Bob reorders the sequence P_A of the travel qubits (the actual ordering is known to Bob only) and inserts Nm decoy photons³, randomly in them and makes a new sequence P'_A which contains $2Nm$ photons (Nm travel photons and Nm decoy photons)⁴ and sends the reordered sequence P'_A to Alice.

³ When $2x$ qubits (a random mix of message qubits and decoy qubits) travel through a channel accessible to Eve and x of them are test for eavesdropping then for any $\delta > 0$, the probability of obtaining less than δn errors on the check qubits (decoy qubits), and more than $(\delta + \epsilon)n$ errors on the remaining x qubits is asymptotically less than $\exp[-O(\epsilon^2 x)]$ for large value of x [23]. As the unconditional security obtained in quantum cryptographic protocol relies on the fact that any attempt of Eavesdropping can be identified. Thus to obtain an unconditional security we always need to check half of travel qubits for eavesdropping. Thus we have to randomly add decoy qubits whose number would be equal to the total number of travel qubits.

⁴ Rearrangement of particle orders provide additional security but it may be avoided in some particular dense coding based cases. Still we prefer to include it in the protocol as it is essential for the security in general, specially for cases where $n = m$, because in those cases since the entire state is sent over the channel a measurement in $\{|\phi_0\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, \dots, |\phi_i\rangle, \dots, |\phi_{2^n-1}\rangle\}$ basis by

3. After confirming that Alice has received all the $2Nm$ photons, Bob announces the position of the decoy photons. Alice measures the corresponding particles in the sequence P'_A by using X basis or Z basis at random, here $X = \{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$ and $Z = \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. After measurement, Alice publicly announces the result of her measurement and the basis used for the measurement. Now the initial state of the decoy photon as noted by Bob during preparation and the measurement outcome of Alice should coincide in all such cases where Alice has used the same basis as was used to prepare the decoy photon. Bob can compute the error rate and check whether it exceeds the predeclared threshold or not. If it exceeds the threshold, then Alice and Bob abort this communication and repeat the procedure from the beginning. Otherwise they go on to the next step. So all intercept-resend attacks will be detected in this step and even if eavesdropping has happened Eve has no information about the encoding operation executed by Bob as the sequence is rearranged.
4. Bob announces the actual order.
5. After knowing the actual order, Alice transforms the sequence into actual order and encodes her information using the same encoding scheme as was used by Bob. That creates a new sequence P''_A . Alice prepares Nm decoy photons in a random sequence of $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$, reorders P''_A and randomly inserts decoy photon in that to convert that into a new sequence P'''_A . She then send the sequence P'''_A to Bob.
6. After confirming that Bob has received all the $2Nm$ photons, Alice announces the position of the decoy photons. Bob measures the corresponding particles in the sequence P'''_A by using X basis or Z basis at random, here $X = \{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$ and $Z = \{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. After measurement, Bob publicly announces the result of his measurement and the basis used for the measurement. Now the initial state of the decoy photon as noted by Alice during preparation and the measurement outcome of Bob should coincide in all such cases where Bob has used the same basis as was used to prepare the decoy photon. Alice can compute the error rate and check whether

it exceeds the predeclared threshold or not. If it exceeds the threshold, then Alice and Bob abort this communication and repeat the procedure from the beginning. Otherwise they go on to the next step. These makes the protocol safe from all kind of eavesdropping strategy in the return path.

7. Alice announces the actual order.
8. Bob reorders the sequence to obtain P''_A . Recombines it with P_B and measures each n -partite state in $\{|\phi_0\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, \dots, |\phi_i\rangle, \dots, |\phi_{2^n-1}\rangle\}$ basis. As he already knows the unitary operators applied by him or the state $|\phi_i\rangle$ sent by him, he can now easily decode the message encoded by Alice. After the measurement Bob publicly announces the final states that he has obtained in sequence.
9. Now as Alice knows her encoding into a particular state she will be able to decode the secret message of Bob.

Now we would like to note that in case $m = n$ then in Step 5 after knowing the actual order Alice could have decoded the message of Bob and in that case the public announcement of Bob in Step 8 and the entire Step 9 would be redundant. In such case, the protocol essentially get decomposed into two protocols of DSQC: one from Alice to Bob and the other from Bob to Alice. That is not really in accordance with the true spirit of the quantum dialogue protocols and consequently we have excluded such cases from the remaining discussion. It is straight to note that neither DSQC nor quantum dialogue protocol requires dense coding as an essential resource but it is always useful. In case of DSQC it is sufficient [25] and in case of quantum dialogue, in addition, the unitary operators should form a group. Now to further clarify that dense coding is not essential for a quantum dialogue protocol we may give a different example, where only the subset of the basis set is used. To be precise, we may use $U_0 = I \otimes I$, $U_1 = I \otimes i\sigma_y$, $U_2 = \sigma_x \otimes I$, $U_3 = \sigma_x \otimes i\sigma_y$ as our unitary operators (these operators form a group) and following 4-qubit W states provide example of required orthogonal states [24]:

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\phi_0\rangle &= U_0|\phi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0001\rangle + |0010\rangle + |0100\rangle + |1000\rangle), \\
 |\phi_1\rangle &= U_1|\phi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0000\rangle - |0011\rangle - |0101\rangle - |1001\rangle), \\
 |\phi_2\rangle &= U_2|\phi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0011\rangle + |0000\rangle + |0110\rangle + |1010\rangle), \\
 |\phi_3\rangle &= U_3|\phi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0010\rangle - |0001\rangle - |0111\rangle - |1011\rangle).
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

This resource would be good enough for an efficient protocol of quantum dialogue. But here we can send only 2 bits of classical information using 2 ebits so this is not dense coding. Consequently, we may conclude that dense coding is not essential for quantum dialogue. Thus the fact that the unitary operators forms a group is most crucial property. In addition since we are interested in discrete variable quantum communication our m qubit unitary operators are supposed to be formed as product of single qubit Pauli operators (1). Let us now try to

Eve can reveal the encoding of Alice without being detected. Further, Alice and Bob must be able to ensure that the secret message do not leak to Eve before she is detected. If we only use the decoy qubit technique then a considerably large amount of information may be leaked to Eve. For example, if Bob use $U_0 = I \otimes I$, $U_1 = I \otimes i\sigma_y$, $U_2 = \sigma_x \otimes I$, $U_3 = \sigma_x \otimes i\sigma_y$ (It is easy to check that these operators forms a group) to encode information on 4 qubit W state, $\frac{1}{2}(|0001\rangle + |0010\rangle + |0100\rangle + |1000\rangle)$ then 75% of the Bob's message will be leaked to Eve before the measurement on decoy photons will be successful to detect her [24]. Rearrangement of order of particle will avoid such incidents.

TABLE I. Group multiplication table for $G_1 = \{I, \sigma_x, i\sigma_y, \sigma_z\} = \{I, X, iY, Z\}$.

Pauli Operators	I	σ_x	$i\sigma_y$	σ_z
I	I	σ_x	$i\sigma_y$	σ_z
σ_x	σ_x	I	σ_z	$i\sigma_y$
$i\sigma_y$	$i\sigma_y$	σ_z	I	σ_x
σ_z	σ_z	$i\sigma_y$	σ_x	I

construct such groups of unitary operators that will be useful for quantum dialogue.

V. HOW TO CONSTRUCT GROUPS AND SUBGROUPS OF UNITARY OPERATORS REQUIRED FOR QUANTUM DIALOGUE?

We have seen that the set of unitary operations used for encoding of information are required to form a group under multiplication (without global phase). Since the Hilbert space of n -qubit system is C^{2^n} so we have 2^n mutually orthogonal state vectors⁵ and 2^n unitary operators. The exclusion of continuous variable communication ensures that the unitary operators are formed by combining Pauli operators (more precisely by combining $I, \sigma_x, i\sigma_y, \sigma_z$). Now it is straight forward to observe that $\{I, \sigma_x, i\sigma_y, \sigma_z\}$ forms a group under multiplication. This is so because there exist an identity operator I . Further the product of two Pauli matrices are described as

$$\sigma_i \cdot \sigma_j = I\delta_{ij} + i \sum_k \epsilon_{ijk} \sigma_k, \quad (3)$$

where ϵ_{ijk} is the Levi-Civita symbol. Thus all Pauli operators are self inverse and consequently inverse of each element of the group is also a member of the group. Since these unitary operators are matrices they automatically satisfy associativity and finally since the product of any two of these operators is another element of the set (see the group multiplication table as provided in Table I) so it forms a group of order 4. Here we would like to note that the multiplication rule is defined as bit wise dot product in such a way that the global phase (a common minus sign in the product matrix) is ignored which is consistent with the quantum mechanics. Thus $G_1 = \{I, \sigma_x, i\sigma_y, \sigma_z\} = \{I, X, iY, Z\}$ forms a group of order 4 under multiplication where the elements are one-qubit unitary operators. Further under the above defined multiplication rule the group is Abelian.

Now since G_1 is a group of order 4 so

$$\begin{aligned} G_2 &= G_1 \otimes G_1 = \{I, X, iY, Z\} \otimes \{I, X, iY, Z\} \\ &= I \otimes I, I \otimes X, I \otimes iY, I \otimes Z, X \otimes I, X \otimes X, \\ &\quad X \otimes iY, X \otimes Z, iY \otimes I, iY \otimes X, iY \otimes iY, \\ &\quad iY \otimes Z, Z \otimes I, Z \otimes X, Z \otimes iY, Z \otimes Z. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

is a group of order $16 = 2^4$. In general, if we have a set of all n -qubit unitary operations such that each n -qubit operation can be viewed as tensor product of n single qubit operations, which are elements of G_1 , then these unitary operators form a group G_n of order $2^{2^n} = 4^n$ or in other words $G_n = G_1^{\otimes n}$ is a group. Now we may recall the well known first Sylow theorem, which is stated as follows:

Sylow Theorem: If G is a group of order $p^k m$, with p prime, and $(p, m) = 1$, then G contains a subgroup of order p^i for each $i \leq k$ and every subgroup of G of order p^i , is normal in some subgroup of order p^{i+1} . In particular, Sylow p -subgroups exist.

So in our case, $p = 2, m = 1, k = 2^n$ and in general G_n has Sylow 2-subgroups of order $2, 4, 8, \dots, 2^{2^n}$. Thus G_2 has subgroups of order $16, 8, 4, 2, 1$. An important question here is how many such subgroups are there? Unfortunately the third Sylow theorem provides an answer to this question for the largest subgroup only. In our case the largest subgroup is the group G_n itself and consequently it has only one subgroup of order 2^{2^n} . But we are interested about subgroups of order 2^i where $0 < i < 2^n$ in general and specially about subgroups of order 2^{n-1} . The reason behind this specific interest would be clear if you consider the odd qubit cases. To be precise, let us think that we have set of 2^t mutually orthogonal t -qubit states where t is odd. Now for efficient encoding in this system one needs 2^t unitary operators. So these operators will be at least $\frac{t+1}{2}$ qubit operators and thus a subset of group $G_n : t \geq n \geq \frac{t+1}{2}$. For example, let us consider the case of 3 qubit GHZ state. Here we have $2^3 = 8$ basis vectors and for successful encoding we will require an order 8 group of unitary operators. Each operator must be at least 2-qubit operator because if you use only single qubit operation then at most you can encode 4 alternatives (2-bit information). Thus the group to be used here must be an order 8 subgroup of G_2 or some higher order group (say G_3, G_4, \dots etc.) as they can also have order 8 subgroups. For example, all subgroups of G_2 will be subgroups of G_3 with third element being I . But since we have a three qubit system we can not use 4 or more qubit operations on them and these limits the possible subgroups that can be used for encoding operation suitable for quantum dialogue. Thus it is clear that the order 8 subgroups of G_2 will play important role in the designing of quantum dialogue protocol using 3-qubit states (such as GHZ state, GHZ -like state etc.) and in some four qubit states where complete dense coding is not possible (such as 4-qubit W state, 4 qubit Cluster state etc.). This is why we are specially interested about the order 8 subgroups of G_2 . We can construct few subgroups very easily. For example, since each Pauli gates

⁵ We may use a subset of these state vectors for encoding but the measurement is done using the entire basis set and any such use of subspace always reduce efficiency.

are self inverse so $\{I, X\}, \{I, iY\}, \{I, Z\}$ are subgroups of G_1 consequently, following are order 8 subgroups of G_2 :

$$\begin{aligned}
G_2^1(8) &= \{I, X, iY, Z\} \otimes \{I, X\} \\
&= \{I \otimes I, X \otimes I, iY \otimes I, Z \otimes I, \\
&\quad I \otimes X, X \otimes X, iY \otimes X, Z \otimes X\} \\
G_2^2(8) &= \{I, X, iY, Z\} \otimes \{I, iY\} \\
&= \{I \otimes I, X \otimes I, iY \otimes I, Z \otimes I, \\
&\quad I \otimes iY, X \otimes iY, iY \otimes iY, Z \otimes iY\} \\
G_2^3(8) &= \{I, X, iY, Z\} \otimes \{I, Z\} \\
&= \{I \otimes I, X \otimes I, iY \otimes I, Z \otimes I, \\
&\quad I \otimes Z, X \otimes Z, iY \otimes Z, Z \otimes Z\} \\
G_2^4(8) &= \{I, X\} \otimes \{I, X, iY, Z\} \\
&= \{I \otimes I, I \otimes X, I \otimes iY, I \otimes Z, \\
&\quad X \otimes I, X \otimes X, X \otimes iY, X \otimes Z\} \\
G_2^5(8) &= \{I, iY\} \otimes \{I, X, iY, Z\} \\
&= \{I \otimes I, I \otimes X, I \otimes iY, I \otimes Z, \\
&\quad iY \otimes I, iY \otimes X, iY \otimes iY, iY \otimes Z\} \\
G_2^6(8) &= \{I, Z\} \otimes \{I, X, iY, Z\} \\
&= \{I \otimes I, I \otimes X, I \otimes iY, I \otimes Z, \\
&\quad Z \otimes I, Z \otimes X, Z \otimes iY, Z \otimes Z\}
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $G_n^j(m)$ denotes j^{th} subgroup of order $m < 4^n$ of the group G_n whose order is 4^n . Similarly we may construct $3n$ subgroups of order 2^{2n-1} of G_n as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
G_1^{\otimes i} \otimes \{I, X\} \otimes G_1^{n-i-1}, \\
G_1^{\otimes i} \otimes \{I, iY\} \otimes G_1^{n-i-1}, \\
G_1^{\otimes i} \otimes \{I, Z\} \otimes G_1^{n-i-1}
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where i varies from 0 to $n-1$. For example, we can easily obtain following 9 order 32 subgroups of G_3 :

$$\begin{aligned}
G_3^1(32) &= G_2 \otimes \{I, X\}, \\
G_3^2(32) &= G_2 \otimes \{I, iY\}, \\
G_3^3(32) &= G_2 \otimes \{I, Z\}, \\
G_3^4(32) &= \{I, X\} \otimes G_2, \\
G_3^5(32) &= \{I, iY\} \otimes G_2, \\
G_3^6(32) &= \{I, Z\} \otimes G_2, \\
G_3^7(32) &= G_1 \otimes \{I, X\} \otimes G_1, \\
G_3^8(32) &= G_1 \otimes \{I, iY\} \otimes G_1, \\
G_3^9(32) &= G_1 \otimes \{I, Z\} \otimes G_1.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

But the above set in (5) is not complete. For example following order 8 subgroups of G_2 , are not in that set,

$$\begin{aligned}
G_2^7(8) &= I \otimes I, I \otimes Z, Z \otimes I, Z \otimes Z, \\
&\quad X \otimes X, iY \otimes X, X \otimes iY, iY \otimes iY \\
G_2^8(8) &= I \otimes I, Z \otimes Z, X \otimes iY, iY \otimes X, \\
&\quad I \otimes X, Z \otimes iY, iY \otimes I, X \otimes Z \\
G_2^9(8) &= I \otimes I, Z \otimes Z, X \otimes iY, iY \otimes X, \\
&\quad X \otimes I, iY \otimes Z, Z \otimes X, I \otimes iY \\
G_2^{10}(8) &= I \otimes I, X \otimes I, I \otimes X, X \otimes X \\
&\quad Z \otimes Z, iY \otimes Z, Z \otimes iY, iY \otimes iY \\
G_2^{11}(8) &= I \otimes I, iY \otimes I, I \otimes iY, iY \otimes iY, \\
&\quad Z \otimes Z, Z \otimes X, X \otimes Z, X \otimes X
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Now if we try to implement a quantum dialogue protocol with 2 qubit EPR states as was done in the original

protocol of Ba An then the single qubit unitary operations defined in G_1 would be sufficient. Similarly as the elements of G_2 does dense coding for 4 qubit Cluster states and 4 qubit Ω states (as shown in Table II) it would be straight forward to note that we can have quantum dialogue protocol for 4-qubit Cluster states and 4 qubit Ω state.

Now it would be interesting to note that the elements of $G_2^1(8)$ and $G_2^2(8)$ may be used for dense coding of GHZ states as shown in Table III and Table IV respectively. We have already logically established that $G_2^1(8)$ is an order 8 subgroup of G_2 but for the convenience of the readers we have also provided group multiplication table for $G_2^1(8)$ as Table V. Similar tables can easily be constructed for other subgroups and groups mentioned here. Since this verification is an easy task we have not provided such tables here. Now since $G_2^1(8)$ and $G_2^2(8)$ are groups of appropriate order and can be used for dense coding in GHZ states we may easily conclude that GHZ states may be used for quantum dialogue. Now the permutation symmetry of the GHZ states and these order 8 subgroups of G_2 ensures that $G_2^4(8)$ and $G_2^5(8)$ will also perform dense coding in GHZ states and consequently be useful for quantum dialogue. Earlier Xia *et al.* [12] had provided protocol for quantum dialogue using GHZ state. The set of unitary operators used by them coincides with $G_2^1(8)$. Since their protocol is an example of Ba An type of protocol, naturally we obtain that as a special case of our more generalized protocol. In addition we obtain at least three more different ways to do encoding operations on GHZ states for quantum dialogue. From the observation that $G_2^1(8)$, $G_2^2(8)$, $G_2^4(8)$ and $G_2^5(8)$ are useful for quantum dialogue using GHZ states, one may be tempted to use $G_2^3(8)$ or $G_2^6(8)$ for the same purpose. But that would not work. Just as an example, in Table VI we have shown that $G_2^3(8)$ can not be used for dense coding operation on GHZ states because $U_0 \frac{|000\rangle+|111\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} = U_5 \frac{|000\rangle+|111\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, U_1 \frac{|000\rangle-|111\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} = U_4 \frac{|000\rangle-|111\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, U_2 \frac{|100\rangle+|011\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} = U_7 \frac{|100\rangle+|011\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $U_3 \frac{|100\rangle-|011\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} = U_6 \frac{|100\rangle-|011\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$. Thus the encoded states are not unique (are not linearly independent). In Table VI we have described the case where the encoding operations are done on first two qubits but the permutation symmetry of the GHZ states ensure that the same conclusion will remain valid even if we apply the same unitary operations on qubits 2, 3 or 1, 3 and also for the set of unitary operations $G_2^6(8)$. Thus this example shows that formation of a group of unitary operators alone is not sufficient for quantum dialogue we also need appropriate quantum states on which that particular group of unitary operators can be applied to implement quantum dialogue. With the similar intention we may note that there exists a set of 8 operators (as shown in Table VII) which may be used for dense coding in GHZ -like states [25] but these operators do not form a group under multiplication since $U_7 U_6 = iY \otimes Z, U_6 U_5 = X \otimes iY$ etc. are not in

TABLE II. Dense coding operation for 4 qubit Omega states $|\Omega\rangle$ and Cluster states $|C\rangle$. The unitary operators operate on the qubits 1 and 3 in both the cases. As all the elements of G_2 group are used as unitary operators for encoding, these two states may be used for quantum dialogue using the generalized protocol presented here.

Unitary Operations	$ \Omega\rangle_0 = \frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 0110\rangle + 1001\rangle - 1111\rangle)$	$ C\rangle_0 = \frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 0011\rangle + 1100\rangle - 1111\rangle)$
$U_0 = I \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 0110\rangle + 1001\rangle - 1111\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 0011\rangle + 1100\rangle - 1111\rangle)$
$U_1 = I \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle - 0110\rangle + 1001\rangle + 1111\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle - 0011\rangle + 1100\rangle + 1111\rangle)$
$U_2 = Z \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 0110\rangle - 1001\rangle + 1111\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 0011\rangle - 1100\rangle + 1111\rangle)$
$U_3 = Z \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle - 0110\rangle - 1001\rangle - 1111\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle - 0011\rangle - 1100\rangle - 1111\rangle)$
$U_4 = I \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}(0010\rangle + 0100\rangle + 1011\rangle - 1101\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0001\rangle + 0010\rangle - 1101\rangle + 1110\rangle)$
$U_5 = I \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 0010\rangle + 0100\rangle - 1011\rangle - 1101\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 0001\rangle + 0010\rangle + 1101\rangle + 1110\rangle)$
$U_6 = Z \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}(0010\rangle + 0100\rangle - 1011\rangle + 1101\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0001\rangle + 0010\rangle + 1101\rangle - 1110\rangle)$
$U_7 = Z \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 0010\rangle + 0100\rangle + 1011\rangle + 1101\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 0001\rangle + 0010\rangle - 1101\rangle - 1110\rangle)$
$U_8 = X \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}(1000\rangle + 1110\rangle + 0001\rangle - 0111\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0100\rangle - 0111\rangle + 1000\rangle + 1011\rangle)$
$U_9 = X \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}(1000\rangle - 1110\rangle + 0001\rangle + 0111\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0100\rangle + 0111\rangle + 1000\rangle - 1011\rangle)$
$U_{10} = iY \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 1000\rangle - 1110\rangle + 0001\rangle - 0111\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0100\rangle - 0111\rangle - 1000\rangle - 1011\rangle)$
$U_{11} = iY \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 1000\rangle + 1110\rangle + 0001\rangle + 0111\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0100\rangle + 0111\rangle - 1000\rangle + 1011\rangle)$
$U_{12} = X \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}(1010\rangle + 1100\rangle + 0011\rangle - 0101\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 0101\rangle + 0110\rangle + 1001\rangle + 1010\rangle)$
$U_{13} = X \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 1010\rangle + 1100\rangle - 0011\rangle - 0101\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0101\rangle + 0110\rangle - 1001\rangle + 1010\rangle)$
$U_{14} = iY \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 1010\rangle - 1100\rangle + 0011\rangle - 0101\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 0101\rangle + 0110\rangle - 1001\rangle - 1010\rangle)$
$U_{15} = iY \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}(1010\rangle - 1100\rangle - 0011\rangle - 0101\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0101\rangle + 0110\rangle + 1001\rangle - 1010\rangle)$

TABLE III. Dense coding of GHZ states using the elements of $G_2^1(8)$.

Unitary operations on qubits 1 and 2	GHZ states
$U_0 = I \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(000\rangle + 111\rangle)$
$U_1 = Z \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(000\rangle - 111\rangle)$
$U_2 = X \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(100\rangle + 011\rangle)$
$U_3 = iY \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 100\rangle + 011\rangle)$
$U_4 = I \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(010\rangle + 101\rangle)$
$U_5 = Z \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(010\rangle - 101\rangle)$
$U_6 = X \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(110\rangle + 001\rangle)$
$U_7 = iY \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 110\rangle + 001\rangle)$

TABLE IV. Dense coding of GHZ states using the elements of $G_2^2(8)$.

Unitary operators on qubits 1 and 2	GHZ states
$U_0 = I \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(000\rangle + 111\rangle)$
$U_1 = Z \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(000\rangle - 111\rangle)$
$U_2 = X \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(100\rangle + 011\rangle)$
$U_3 = iY \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 100\rangle + 011\rangle)$
$U_4 = I \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 010\rangle + 101\rangle)$
$U_5 = Z \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 010\rangle - 101\rangle)$
$U_6 = X \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 110\rangle + 001\rangle)$
$U_7 = iY \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(110\rangle + 001\rangle)$

the set $\{U_0, U_1, \dots, U_7\}$ used here for dense coding. Consequently, if Bob applies U_6 and Alice applies U_7 then the quantum dialogue protocol will fail. Thus this example shows that dense coding alone is not also sufficient for quantum dialogue. This does not

TABLE V. Group multiplication table for $G_2^1(8)$, where $U_0 = I \otimes I$, $U_1 = Z \otimes I$, $U_2 = X \otimes I$, $U_3 = iY \otimes I$, $U_4 = I \otimes X$, $U_5 = Z \otimes X$, $U_6 = X \otimes X$, $U_7 = iY \otimes X$.

Unitary operations	U_0	U_1	U_2	U_3	U_4	U_5	U_6	U_7
U_0	U_0	U_1	U_2	U_3	U_4	U_5	U_6	U_7
U_1	U_1	U_0	U_3	U_2	U_5	U_4	U_7	U_6
U_2	U_2	U_3	U_0	U_1	U_6	U_7	U_4	U_5
U_3	U_3	U_2	U_1	U_0	U_7	U_6	U_5	U_4
U_4	U_4	U_5	U_6	U_7	U_0	U_1	U_2	U_3
U_5	U_5	U_4	U_7	U_6	U_1	U_0	U_3	U_2
U_6	U_6	U_7	U_4	U_5	U_2	U_3	U_0	U_1
U_7	U_7	U_6	U_5	U_4	U_3	U_2	U_1	U_0

TABLE VI. In $G_2^3(8)$ dense coding is not possible but group multiplication table exists. “Dense coding is helpful (sufficient) but not essential”.

Unitary operations on qubits 1 and 2	Non orthogonal GHZ states
$U_0 = I \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(000\rangle + 111\rangle)$
$U_1 = Z \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(000\rangle - 111\rangle)$
$U_2 = X \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(100\rangle + 011\rangle)$
$U_3 = iY \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 100\rangle + 011\rangle)$
$U_4 = I \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(000\rangle - 111\rangle)$
$U_5 = Z \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(000\rangle + 111\rangle)$
$U_6 = X \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(100\rangle - 011\rangle)$
$U_7 = iY \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 100\rangle - 011\rangle)$

really mean that we can not obtain a quantum dialogue protocol with GHZ -like state; another set of operators may satisfy the sufficiency condition introduced here. To establish this point, we may look at Table VIII where it is shown that $G_2^9(8)$ may be used for dense

TABLE VII. Dense coding of *GHZ-like* states. Unitary operators do not form a group.

Unitary operator	State
$U_0 = I \otimes I$	$\frac{ \psi^+0\rangle + \psi^-1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$
$U_1 = X \otimes X$	$\frac{ \psi^+0\rangle - \psi^-1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$
$U_2 = Z \otimes I$	$\frac{ \psi^-0\rangle + \psi^+1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$
$U_3 = iY \otimes I$	$\frac{ \phi^+1\rangle - \phi^-0\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$
$U_4 = I \otimes X$	$\frac{ \phi^+0\rangle + \phi^-1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$
$U_5 = X \otimes I$	$\frac{ \phi^+0\rangle - \phi^-1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$
$U_6 = I \otimes iY$	$\frac{ \phi^-0\rangle + \phi^+1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$
$U_7 = iY \otimes X$	$\frac{ \psi^+1\rangle - \psi^-0\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$

coding in *GHZ-like* state and also for dense coding in 4 qubit *W* state. Thus both 3 qubit *GHZ-like* state and 4 qubit *W* state can be used for quantum dialogue. These particular examples just show that for quantum dialogue we need to simultaneously satisfy both the conditions discussed above. In Table IX we have shown an alternative way for encoding of information in 4 qubit *W* states for implementation of quantum dialogue protocol. To be precise, Table IX shows that we can also use the elements of $G_2^8(8)$ to implement quantum dialogue using 4 qubit *W* states. Thus there are at least two different ways to implement quantum dialogue using *W* states. Similarly there are at least six different ways to implement quantum dialogue using *GHZ-like* states by using $G_2^2(8), G_2^3(8), G_2^4(8), G_2^5(8), G_2^6(8)$ and $G_2^7(8)$. The dense coding of *GHZ-like* states using the elements of $G_2^2(8), G_2^3(8)$ and $G_2^4(8)$ subgroups are shown in Table VIII, Table X and Table XI respectively. The other three cases (i.e. dense coding using $G_2^5(8), G_2^6(8), G_2^7(8)$) can be verified in the similar way. Four qubit Q_4 state and 4 qubit Q_5 state introduced in [26] are also very interesting as there are at least 2 different ways to implement quantum dialogue using Q_4 state and at least 3 different ways to implement quantum dialogue using Q_5 state. To be precise, in Table XI and Table XII we have shown that quantum dialogue can be implemented using Q_4 state by using the elements $G_2^6(8)$ and $G_2^7(8)$ respectively. Similarly, we can perform dense coding on Q_5 state by elements of $G_2^3(8), G_2^4(8)$ and $G_2^5(8)$. In Table XIII dense coding of Q_5 state by using the elements of $G_2^4(8)$ is shown. The other two examples can be verified in the same manner. Now in Table XIV we have shown that 5 qubit Brown state and 5 qubit Cluster state can be used for quantum dialogue if the information are encoded by the elements of $G_3^7(32)$. This is only a particular example, we have verified that dense coding can be done on 5 qubit Brown state in at least 6 different ways by using the elements of $G_3^1(32), G_3^2(32), G_3^3(32), G_3^4(32), G_3^5(32), G_3^6(32)$ and similarly on 5 qubit Cluster state in at least 4 different ways

by using the elements of $G_3^4(32), G_3^5(32), G_3^7(32), G_3^8(32)$. Thus quantum dialogue can be implemented in several ways by using 5 qubit states. In brief, our generalized protocol can be used to implement quantum dialogue using Bell state, 4 and 5 qubit Cluster states, Ω state, Q_4 state, Q_5 state, *W* state, *GHZ* state, *GHZ-like* state, 5 qubit Brown state etc.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have explored the underlying symmetry of the existing quantum dialogue protocols and have shown that the information splitting plays a crucial role in their implementation. Then we have obtained a sufficiency condition for implementation of quantum dialogue. The sufficiency condition obtained may be briefly stated as: If we have a set of mutually orthogonal n -qubit states $\{|\phi_0\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, \dots, |\phi_i\rangle, \dots, |\phi_{2^n-1}\rangle\}$ and a set of m - qubit ($m \leq n$) unitary operators $\{U_0, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{2^n-1}\}$ such that the $U_i|\phi_0\rangle = |\phi_i\rangle$ and $\{U_0, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{2^n-1}\}$ forms a group under multiplication then it would be sufficient to construct a quantum dialogue protocol of Ba An type using this set of quantum states and this group of unitary operators. We have used this sufficiency condition to provide a generalized algorithm for implementation of quantum dialogue. All the existing Ba An type of quantum dialogue protocol thus automatically become special cases of our protocol. We have also provided a systematic way of generating groups of unitary operators that are useful for implementation of quantum dialogue and have shown that those groups may be used to implement our generalized quantum dialogue protocol using Bell state, 4 qubit and 5 qubit Cluster states, Ω state, Q_4 state, Q_5 state, *W* state, *GHZ* state, *GHZ-like* state, Brown state etc. To reach at this conclusion, we have used several Tables of dense coding. Here we have obtained them through a systematic and independent approach, where all the unitary operators of a group or subgroup of appropriate order are applied on the quantum state of interest and the orthogonality of the outputs are checked. To be precise, if we wish to study the possibility of implementing quantum dialogue using 3-qubit *GHZ* states then we would apply all the order 8 subgroups of G_2 on the *GHZ* state and see which subgroups yield a set of 8 mutually orthogonal states. For example, we found that $G_2^1(8), G_2^2(8), G_2^4(8)$ and $G_2^5(8)$ are such subgroups which provides us *useful dense coding*⁶ scheme. Our systematic approach has produced a large number of *useful dense coding* schemes. A few of these dense coding schemes can also be found in the existing literature. For example, *useful dense coding* operations for 4 qubit Cluster state is discussed in [27]

⁶ By useful dense coding we mean that the operators used for dense coding forms a group and consequently, the combination of the group of unitary operators and the quantum state is useful for quantum dialogue.

TABLE VIII. Dense coding of GHZ -like states and W states using the elements of $G_2^9(8)$.

Unitary operations on qubits 1 and 2	$ \lambda\rangle_{GHZ-like} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(010\rangle + 100\rangle + 001\rangle + 111\rangle)$	$ W\rangle_0 = \frac{1}{2}(0001\rangle + 0010\rangle + 0100\rangle + 1000\rangle)$
$U_0 = I \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(010\rangle + 100\rangle + 001\rangle + 111\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0001\rangle + 0010\rangle + 0100\rangle + 1000\rangle)$
$U_1 = Z \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 010\rangle - 100\rangle + 001\rangle + 111\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0001\rangle + 0010\rangle - 1000\rangle - 0100\rangle)$
$U_2 = X \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(100\rangle - 010\rangle - 111\rangle + 001\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 1101\rangle - 1110\rangle + 1000\rangle - 0100\rangle)$
$U_3 = iY \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 100\rangle + 010\rangle - 111\rangle + 001\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 1101\rangle - 1110\rangle - 1000\rangle + 0100\rangle)$
$U_4 = X \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(110\rangle + 000\rangle + 101\rangle + 011\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(1001\rangle + 1010\rangle + 1100\rangle + 0000\rangle)$
$U_5 = iY \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(110\rangle + 000\rangle - 101\rangle - 011\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 1001\rangle - 1010\rangle + 1100\rangle + 0000\rangle)$
$U_6 = Z \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(000\rangle - 110\rangle + 011\rangle - 101\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0101\rangle + 0110\rangle + 0000\rangle - 1100\rangle)$
$U_7 = I \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(000\rangle - 110\rangle - 011\rangle + 101\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 0101\rangle - 0110\rangle + 0000\rangle - 1100\rangle)$

TABLE IX. Dense coding of W states using the elements of $G_2^8(8)$.

Unitary operations on qubits 1 and 2	$ W\rangle_0 = \frac{1}{2}(0001\rangle + 0010\rangle + 0100\rangle + 1000\rangle)$
$U_0 = I \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}(0001\rangle + 0010\rangle + 0100\rangle + 1000\rangle)$
$U_1 = Z \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}(0001\rangle + 0010\rangle - 1000\rangle - 0100\rangle)$
$U_2 = X \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 1101\rangle - 1110\rangle + 1000\rangle - 0100\rangle)$
$U_3 = iY \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 1101\rangle - 1110\rangle - 1000\rangle + 0100\rangle)$
$U_4 = I \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}(0101\rangle + 0110\rangle + 0000\rangle + 1100\rangle)$
$U_5 = Z \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 0101\rangle - 0110\rangle + 0000\rangle + 1100\rangle)$
$U_6 = iY \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 1001\rangle - 1010\rangle - 1100\rangle + 0000\rangle)$
$U_7 = X \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}(1001\rangle + 1010\rangle - 1100\rangle + 0000\rangle)$

in a different context (in context of DSQC). Similarly, in a different context *useful dense coding* schemes (only one scheme for each case) for the Ω state, Q_4 state, Q_5 state, W state are reported in [26], also in [28] a dense coding scheme for 5 qubit Brown states is reported⁷. Our systematic approach have yielded additional schemes of *useful dense coding* using GHZ , W , Q_4 , Q_5 and Brown states and new examples of *useful dense coding* schemes using GHZ -like states and 5 qubit Cluster states. The present paper is focused on quantum dialogue but the newly found *useful dense coding* schemes can find their applications on other aspects of quantum communication (e.g. DSQC) and quantum games. It is not our purpose to discuss those possibilities here. Rather we would like to note that our group theoretic approach provides a wide choice of possible quantum states that can be used for quantum dialogue.

TABLE X. Dense coding of GHZ -like state by using the elements of $G_2^3(8)$.

Unitary operations on qubits 1 and 2	$ \lambda\rangle_{GHZ-like} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(010\rangle + 100\rangle + 001\rangle + 111\rangle)$
$U_0 = I \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(010\rangle + 100\rangle + 001\rangle + 111\rangle)$
$U_1 = Z \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(010\rangle - 100\rangle + 001\rangle - 111\rangle)$
$U_2 = X \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(110\rangle + 000\rangle + 101\rangle + 011\rangle)$
$U_3 = iY \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 110\rangle + 000\rangle - 101\rangle + 011\rangle)$
$U_4 = I \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 010\rangle + 100\rangle + 001\rangle - 111\rangle)$
$U_5 = Z \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 010\rangle - 100\rangle + 001\rangle + 111\rangle)$
$U_6 = X \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 110\rangle + 000\rangle + 101\rangle - 011\rangle)$
$U_7 = iY \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(110\rangle + 000\rangle - 101\rangle - 011\rangle)$

Quantum dialogue can be implemented by using same quantum state but by using different groups of unitary operators as discussed above and summarized in Table XV. For example, we have shown that there exist at least 4 different groups of unitary operators ($G_2^1(8)$, $G_2^2(8)$, $G_2^4(8)$ and $G_2^5(8)$) that may be used to implement quantum dialogue using GHZ state. Similarly there exist at least six different ways (by using $G_2^2(8)$, $G_2^3(8)$, $G_2^5(8)$, $G_2^6(8)$, $G_2^8(8)$ and $G_2^9(8)$) to implement quantum dialogue using GHZ -like states, six different ways to implement quantum dialogue using 5 qubit Brown state (by using $G_3^1(32)$, $G_3^2(32)$, $G_3^4(32)$, $G_3^5(32)$, $G_3^7(32)$ and $G_3^8(32)$), four different ways (by using $G_3^4(32)$, $G_3^5(32)$, $G_3^7(32)$, $G_3^8(32)$) to implement quantum dialogue using 5 qubit Cluster state, three different ways (by using $G_2^3(8)$, $G_2^4(8)$ and $G_2^5(8)$) to implement quantum dialogue using Q_5 state and so on. If we closely look at these groups and subgroups of unitary operators we will observe an intrinsic symmetry. For example, $G_3^1(32) = G_2 \otimes \{I, X\}$, $G_3^4(32) = \{I, X\} \otimes G_2$ and $G_3^7(32) = G_1 \otimes \{I, X\} \otimes G_1$ are similar only the positions of specific Pauli operators are changing or in other words they are equivalent under swapping of qubits on which a particular set of operators are applied. Thus once we find out a particular group of unitary operators for dense coding of a quantum state then from the permutation symmetry of the quantum state we can

⁷ In Table V of [28] dense coding of 5 qubit Brown state is attempted. The table has some typos. Unitary operations of the corrected table will coincide with $G_3^1(32)$.

TABLE XI. Dense coding of GHZ -like and Q_4 states by using the elements of $G_2^6(8)$.

Unitary Operations on qubits 1 and 2	$ \lambda\rangle_{GHZ-like} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(010\rangle + 100\rangle + 001\rangle + 111\rangle)$	$ Q_4\rangle_0 = \frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 0101\rangle + 1000\rangle + 1110\rangle)$
$U_0 = I \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(010\rangle + 100\rangle + 001\rangle + 111\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 0101\rangle + 1000\rangle + 1110\rangle)$
$U_1 = I \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 010\rangle + 100\rangle + 001\rangle - 111\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle - 0101\rangle + 1000\rangle - 1110\rangle)$
$U_2 = I \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(000\rangle + 110\rangle + 011\rangle + 101\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0100\rangle + 0001\rangle + 1100\rangle + 1010\rangle)$
$U_3 = I \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(000\rangle - 110\rangle - 011\rangle + 101\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 0100\rangle + 0001\rangle - 1100\rangle + 1010\rangle)$
$U_4 = Z \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(010\rangle - 100\rangle + 001\rangle - 111\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 0101\rangle - 1000\rangle - 1110\rangle)$
$U_5 = Z \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(- 010\rangle - 100\rangle + 001\rangle + 111\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle - 0101\rangle - 1000\rangle + 1110\rangle)$
$U_6 = Z \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(000\rangle - 110\rangle + 011\rangle - 101\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(0100\rangle + 0001\rangle - 1100\rangle - 1010\rangle)$
$U_7 = Z \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(000\rangle + 110\rangle - 011\rangle - 101\rangle)$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 0100\rangle + 0001\rangle + 1100\rangle - 1010\rangle)$

TABLE XII. Dense coding of Q_4 states using the elements of $G_2^7(8)$. The operators are applied on qubits 1 and 2.

Unitary operations	Operators	$ Q_4\rangle_0 = \frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 0101\rangle + 1000\rangle + 1110\rangle)$
U_0	$I \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 0101\rangle + 1000\rangle + 1110\rangle)$
U_1	$I \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle - 0101\rangle + 1000\rangle - 1110\rangle)$
U_2	$Z \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 0101\rangle - 1000\rangle - 1110\rangle)$
U_3	$Z \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle - 0101\rangle - 1000\rangle + 1110\rangle)$
U_4	$X \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}(1100\rangle + 1001\rangle + 0100\rangle + 0010\rangle)$
U_5	$iY \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 1100\rangle - 1001\rangle + 0100\rangle + 0010\rangle)$
U_6	$X \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 1100\rangle + 1001\rangle - 0100\rangle + 0010\rangle)$
U_7	$iY \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}(1100\rangle - 1001\rangle - 0100\rangle + 0010\rangle)$

TABLE XIII. Dense coding of Q_5 states using the elements of $G_2^4(8)$. The operators are applied on qubits 1 and 2.

Unitary operations	Operators	$ Q_5\rangle_0 = \frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 1011\rangle + 1101\rangle + 1110\rangle)$
U_0	$I \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 1011\rangle + 1101\rangle + 1110\rangle)$
U_1	$X \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}(1000\rangle + 0011\rangle + 0101\rangle + 0110\rangle)$
U_2	$I \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}(0100\rangle + 1111\rangle + 1001\rangle + 1010\rangle)$
U_3	$X \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}(1100\rangle + 0111\rangle + 0001\rangle + 0010\rangle)$
U_4	$I \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 0100\rangle - 1111\rangle + 1001\rangle + 1010\rangle)$
U_5	$X \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}(- 1100\rangle - 0111\rangle + 0001\rangle + 0010\rangle)$
U_6	$I \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}(0000\rangle + 1011\rangle - 1101\rangle - 1110\rangle)$
U_7	$X \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}(1000\rangle + 0011\rangle - 0101\rangle - 0110\rangle)$

conclude whether other similar groups will do the dense coding or not.

Our results can be easily extended to secured multi-party computation (SMC) tasks. As an example, here we will briefly describe how our results can be used to obtain solution of a specific SMC task which is known as socialist millionaire problem [29]. In this problem two millionaire wish to compare their wealth but they do not want to disclose the amount of their wealth to each other. This problem is also referred as the problem of private comparison of equal information. Now if we consider that Alice and Bob are the millionaire who wants to compare their wealth and Charlie is a semi-honest third party then our protocol works as follows: Charlie prepares an n -qubit en-

tangled state in one of the possible mutually orthogonal states $\{|\phi_0\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, \dots, |\phi_i\rangle, \dots, |\phi_{2^n-1}\rangle\}$ (say he prepares it in $|\phi_i\rangle$) and keeps the home photons with himself and sends the travel photons to Alice, who encodes her information (the value of her wealth) by applying unitary operations $\{U_0, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{2^n-1}\}$ as per the encoding rule. Then Alice sends the encoded qubits to Bob. As Bob has access to only travel photons and since he does not know initial state he can not obtain the information encoded by Alice. Now Bob also encodes his information (the value of his wealth) by using the same set of encoding operations $\{U_0, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{2^n-1}\}$ and sends the qubits to Charlie. Now if $\{U_0, U_1, U_2, \dots, U_{2^n-1}\}$ forms a group under multiplication then Charlie will obtain one of the mutually orthogonal state. Charlie can measure the final state using $\{|\phi_0\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, \dots, |\phi_i\rangle, \dots, |\phi_{2^n-1}\rangle\}$ as basis and deterministically obtain the final state $|\phi_f\rangle$. Till this point this protocol is similar to the quantum dialogue protocol. The difference between the two protocols is that instead of Alice now Charlie prepares the initial state and Charlie knows nothing about Alice and Bob's encoding. He knows only the final state and initial state, so his knowledge is same as that of Eve in the previous protocol. If Charlie finds that the initial state and the final state are same (i.e. $|\phi_i\rangle = |\phi_f\rangle$) then the classical information encoded by Alice and Bob are same. In all other cases the classical information encoded by Alice and Bob are different. If we consider the encoded information as the amount of their assets then it solves socialist millionaire problem. Neither Alice, nor Bob, nor even Charlie knows how much assets are there in possession of other. Since classical broadcasting is not required here, the intrinsic problem of information leakage in quantum dialogue protocol is not present here. Thus the wide range of unitary operators and quantum states obtained here for implementation of quantum dialogue protocol (as summarized in Table XV) can also be used to provide solutions of socialist millionaire problem.

Here it would be apt to note that there also exist a hierarchy among quantum communication protocols. For example, any quantum dialogue protocol may be reduced to a DSQC protocol by considering that Bob does not send any meaningful information (does not encode any information), rather he just randomly sends one of the state $\{|\phi_0\rangle, |\phi_1\rangle, \dots, |\phi_i\rangle, \dots, |\phi_{2^n-1}\rangle\}$ to Alice and Alice encodes secret information as per the above protocol. Now it is well known that all DSQC and QSDC protocols can be reduced to protocols of QKD. It is easy to visualize, if instead of a meaningful information Alice sends a random key to Bob then a DSQC or QSDC protocol will become a QKD protocol. Similarly in a quantum dialogue protocol if Alice and Bob both sends each other a set of random bits then at the end of successful conversation they will be able to generate two sets of unconditionally secure key. Thus a quantum dialogue protocol can always be used to implement DSQC and QKD protocol but the converse is not true.

From the perspective of experimental implementation it is a very attractive situation as there are so many options to implement the same task (quantum dialogue and solution of socialist millionaire problem) and thus the current work is expected to motivate experimentalist. It is indeed attractive but the situation is actually more favorable because we have just given a handful of examples. A simple computer program can generate all the relevant subgroups of G_n and the set of states that are unitarily connected by the elements of a particular subgroup or group.

TABLE XIV. Dense coding of 5 qubit Brown state and Cluster state using the elements of $G_3^7(32)$.

Unitary operators on 1, 2 and 3 qubits	$ C_5\rangle = \frac{1}{2}[00000\rangle + 00111\rangle + 11101\rangle + 11010\rangle]$	$ \psi\rangle_{Brown} = \frac{1}{2}[001\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 010\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 100\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 111\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_0 = I \otimes I \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 00000\rangle + 00111\rangle + 11101\rangle + 11010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 001\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 010\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 100\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 111\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_1 = X \otimes I \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 10000\rangle + 10111\rangle + 01101\rangle + 01010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 101\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 110\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 000\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 011\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_2 = iY \otimes I \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 10000\rangle - 10111\rangle + 01101\rangle + 01010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 101\rangle \phi_-\rangle - 110\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 000\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 011\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_3 = Z \otimes I \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 00000\rangle + 00111\rangle - 11101\rangle - 11010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 001\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 010\rangle \psi_-\rangle - 100\rangle \phi_+\rangle - 111\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_4 = I \otimes I \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 00100\rangle + 00011\rangle + 11001\rangle + 11110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 000\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 011\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 101\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 110\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_5 = X \otimes I \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 10100\rangle + 10011\rangle + 01001\rangle + 01110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 100\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 111\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 001\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 010\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_6 = iY \otimes I \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 10100\rangle - 10011\rangle + 01001\rangle + 01110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 100\rangle \phi_-\rangle - 111\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 001\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 010\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_7 = Z \otimes I \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 00100\rangle + 00011\rangle - 11001\rangle - 11110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 000\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 011\rangle \psi_-\rangle - 101\rangle \phi_+\rangle - 110\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_8 = I \otimes I \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 00100\rangle + 00011\rangle + 11001\rangle - 11110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 000\rangle \phi_-\rangle - 011\rangle \psi_-\rangle - 101\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 110\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_9 = X \otimes I \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 10100\rangle + 10011\rangle + 01001\rangle - 01110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 100\rangle \phi_-\rangle - 111\rangle \psi_-\rangle - 001\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 010\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{10} = iY \otimes I \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 10100\rangle - 10011\rangle + 01001\rangle - 01110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 100\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 111\rangle \psi_-\rangle - 001\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 010\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{11} = Z \otimes I \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 00100\rangle + 00011\rangle - 11001\rangle + 11110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 000\rangle \phi_-\rangle - 011\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 101\rangle \phi_+\rangle - 110\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{12} = I \otimes I \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 00000\rangle - 00111\rangle - 11101\rangle + 11010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 001\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 010\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 100\rangle \phi_+\rangle - 111\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{13} = X \otimes I \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 10000\rangle - 10111\rangle - 01101\rangle + 01010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 101\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 110\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 000\rangle \phi_+\rangle - 011\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{14} = iY \otimes I \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 10000\rangle + 10111\rangle - 01101\rangle + 01010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 101\rangle \phi_-\rangle - 110\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 000\rangle \phi_+\rangle - 011\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{15} = Z \otimes I \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 00000\rangle - 00111\rangle + 11101\rangle - 11010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 001\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 010\rangle \psi_-\rangle - 100\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 111\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{16} = I \otimes X \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 01000\rangle + 01111\rangle + 10101\rangle + 10010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 011\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 000\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 110\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 101\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{17} = X \otimes X \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 11000\rangle + 11111\rangle + 00101\rangle + 00010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 111\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 100\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 010\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 001\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{18} = iY \otimes X \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 11000\rangle - 11111\rangle + 00101\rangle + 00010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 111\rangle \phi_-\rangle - 100\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 010\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 001\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{19} = Z \otimes X \otimes I$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 01000\rangle + 01111\rangle - 10101\rangle - 10010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 011\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 000\rangle \psi_-\rangle - 110\rangle \phi_+\rangle - 101\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{20} = I \otimes X \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 01100\rangle + 01011\rangle + 10001\rangle + 10110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 010\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 001\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 111\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 100\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{21} = X \otimes X \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 11100\rangle + 11011\rangle + 00001\rangle + 00110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 110\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 101\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 011\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 000\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{22} = iY \otimes X \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 11100\rangle - 11011\rangle + 00001\rangle + 00110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 110\rangle \phi_-\rangle - 101\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 011\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 000\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{23} = Z \otimes X \otimes X$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 01100\rangle + 01011\rangle - 10001\rangle - 10110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 010\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 001\rangle \psi_-\rangle - 111\rangle \phi_+\rangle - 100\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{24} = I \otimes X \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 01100\rangle + 01011\rangle + 10001\rangle - 10110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 010\rangle \phi_-\rangle - 001\rangle \psi_-\rangle - 111\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 100\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{25} = X \otimes X \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 11100\rangle + 11011\rangle + 00001\rangle - 00110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 110\rangle \phi_-\rangle - 101\rangle \psi_-\rangle - 011\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 000\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{26} = iY \otimes X \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 11100\rangle - 11011\rangle + 00001\rangle - 00110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 110\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 101\rangle \psi_-\rangle - 011\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 000\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{27} = Z \otimes X \otimes iY$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 01100\rangle + 01011\rangle - 10001\rangle + 10110\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 010\rangle \phi_-\rangle - 001\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 111\rangle \phi_+\rangle - 100\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{28} = I \otimes X \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 01000\rangle - 01111\rangle - 10101\rangle + 10010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 011\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 000\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 110\rangle \phi_+\rangle - 101\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{29} = X \otimes X \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 11000\rangle - 11111\rangle - 00101\rangle + 00010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 111\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 100\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 010\rangle \phi_+\rangle - 001\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{30} = iY \otimes X \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 11000\rangle + 11111\rangle - 00101\rangle + 00010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 111\rangle \phi_-\rangle - 100\rangle \psi_-\rangle + 010\rangle \phi_+\rangle - 001\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$
$U_{31} = Z \otimes X \otimes Z$	$\frac{1}{2}[+ 01000\rangle - 01111\rangle + 10101\rangle - 10010\rangle]$	$\frac{1}{2}[- 011\rangle \phi_-\rangle + 000\rangle \psi_-\rangle - 110\rangle \phi_+\rangle + 101\rangle \psi_+\rangle]$

TABLE XV. List of useful quantum states and corresponding operators that may be used to implement our generalized protocol of quantum dialogue.

Quantum state	Group of unitary operations
4 qubit Q_4	$G_2^6(8), G_2^7(8)$
3 qubit GHZ	$G_2^1(8), G_2^2(8), G_2^4(8), G_2^5(8)$
3 qubit GHZ -like	$G_2^2(8), G_2^3(8), G_2^5(8), G_2^6(8), G_2^8(8), G_2^9(8)$
4 qubit W	$G_2^8(8), G_2^9(8)$
4 qubit Q_5	$G_2^3(8), G_2^4(8), G_2^5(8)$
4 qubit Cluster state	G_2
4 qubit Ω state	G_2
2 qubit Bell state	G_1
5 qubit Brown state	$G_3^1(32), G_3^2(32), G_3^4(32), G_3^5(32), G_3^7(32), G_3^8(32)$
5 qubit Cluster state	$G_3^4(32), G_3^5(32), G_3^7(32), G_3^8(32)$

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

AP thanks Department of Science and Technology (DST), India for support provided through the DST project No. SR/S2/LOP/2010. AP also thanks the Ministry of Education of the Czech Republic for support provided through the project CZ.1.05/2.1.00/03.0058.

-
- [1] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems, and Signal Processing, Bangalore, p. 175 (1984).
 - [2] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 661.
 - [3] C. H. Bennett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68** (1992) 3121.
 - [4] L. Goldenberg and L. Vaidman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 1239.
 - [5] M. Hillery, V. Buzek and A. Bertaiume, Phys. Rev. A **59** (1999) 1829.
 - [6] K. Shimizu and N. Imoto, Phys. Rev. A **60** (1999) 157.
 - [7] K. Bostrom and T. Felbinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** 187902 (2002).
 - [8] M. Lucamarini and S. Mancini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94** (2005) 140501.
 - [9] G. Long, *et al.*, Front. Phys. China, **2** (2007) 251.
 - [10] B. A. Nguyen, Phys. Lett. A **328** (2004) 6.
 - [11] Z. X. Man, Z. J. Zhang, and Y. Li, Chin. Phys. Lett. **22** (2005) 22.
 - [12] Y. Xia *et al.*, J. Korean Phys. Soc., **48** (2006) 2427.
 - [13] L. Dong *et al.*, Commun. Theor. Phys. **52** (2009) 853.
 - [14] X. Wen, Y. Liu and N. Zhou Opt. Comm. **275** (2007) 278.
 - [15] G. Gao, Opt. Comm. **283** (2010) 2288.
 - [16] M. Naseri, Int. J. Quant. Info. **9** (2011) 1677.
 - [17] G. F. Shi, Opt. Comm. **283** (2010) 5275.
 - [18] Y. Sun *et al.*, Opt. Comm. **282** (2009) 2278.
 - [19] S. Jain *et al.*, Euro. Phys. Lett. **87** (2009) 60008.
 - [20] Y. G. Tang and Q Y Cai, Int. J. Quant. Info. **6** (2008) 325.
 - [21] I. D. K. Brown *et al.*, J. Phys. A **38** (2005) 1119.
 - [22] C. Y. Lu *et al.*, Nature Phys. **3** (2007) 91.
 - [23] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, New Delhi (2008) 589.
 - [24] H. Yuan *et al.*, Int. J. Theo. Phys. **50** (2011) 2403.
 - [25] A. Banerjee and A. Pathak, arXiv:1201.3763v1 (quant-ph).
 - [26] B. Pradhan, P. Agrawal and A. K. Pati, arXiv:0705.1917v1 (quant-ph).
 - [27] C. W. Tsai, C. W. Hsieh and T. Hwang, Eur. Phys. J. D **61** (2011) 779.
 - [28] S. Muralidharan and P. K. Panigrahi, Phys. Rev. A **77** (2008) 032321.
 - [29] W. Liu, Y. B. Wang and Z. T. Jiang, Optics Communications **284** (2011) 3160.